CF 1 to 4 (3) (1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

CHHATTISGARH

W.P. NO. ...366.../2004

PETITIONER : Dr. Bheem Singh Uikey
S/o Shri Bhadoo Ram Uikey
Aged about 47 years,
R/o. Village Songara,
District Surguja (C.G.),

P. R. No. 353/04 Presented by Shri Manoj Shrivastava dated 22.03.04

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through –Secretary,
Health and Medical Services,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. The State of M.P.
Through - Secretary
General Administration
(State Reorganization cell)
Ministry, Satpura Bhawan,
Bhopal (M.P.)

RECEIVED COPY 31/3/04 Clerk to A.G. Bilaspur

3. Union of India,
Through - Secretary
Personnel and Training, Ministry of Personnel Public Grievances and Pensions Loknayak Bhawan, Khan Market, New Delhi (Reorganization Cell)

उपायुक्त, बिलासपुर संभाग बिलासपुर

4. The Director,
Health and Medical Services,
Raipur (C.G.)

Received Copy Shri Yadav 03-02-04 Clerk to Shri VINAY HARIT Senior Central Government Standing Counsel CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT

5. The Chief Medical and Health officer,
Ambikapur, Distt. Surguja (C.G.)

(4)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION AND OTHERS SUITABLE WRITS, DIRECTION/DIRECTIONS, ORDER/ORDERS

XI-HC-22

(49)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 366/04 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

8/3/2004

Shri Manoj Paranjpe for the petitioner.

Shri Akhil Agrawal, Panel Lawyer, for the respondents no.1,4 and 5.

Shri V.V.S. Moorthy, Addl. Standing Counsel, for respondent no.3.

Application for urgent hearing is allowed.

Heard on I.A. No.1138/04 for taking documents on record.

Not opposed. The application is allowed.

The documents are taken on record.

With the consent of the parties, the matter is heard finally.

The petitioner, who is a Doctor, has filed the present petition challenging the action of respondents in not relieving him, though he has been finally allocated to the State of Madhya Pradesh.

This fact is not disputed by the other side.

This Court, while passing the order dated 17/12/2003 in W.P. No.516/03 (Dr. Ashok Kumar Jain and others vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others), has dealt with the matter in great detail.

[पीछे देखिये

(50)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

Having thus considered and in view of the decision in the aforesaid case, in the opinion of this Court, it is directed that the order staying the operation of the relieving order is without any authority and cannot be sustained and the petitioner is entitled for relieving.

Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the respondents are directed to relieve the petitioner forthwith.

Consequently, M.W.P. No.320/04 also stands disposed of.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
Fakhruddin
Judge

[पीछे देखिये